

Remarks

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-12, 14-38 and 44-47 are pending. Claims 2-3, 8, 13 and 39-43 are canceled and new Claims 44-47 are added in this Response.

Claim Objections

Claim 26 has been amended to correct the error noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. The amendment to Claim 10 corrects the errors noted in Claims 14 and 29. Claim 4 already recites "further including" the added step. The objection to Claim 4, therefore, is felt to be incorrect.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 9, 13 and 24 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 8 and, accordingly, Claim 8 has been canceled. Claim 1 as amended is, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 13 and, accordingly, Claim 13 has been canceled. Claim 10 as amended is, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-7 and 9 and 11-12 and 14-38, which depend from Claims 1 and 10, respectively, are also now in condition for allowance.

New Claims 44-47

New Claim 47 incorporates the limitations of allowable Claim 13 into an independent claim. Claim 47 recites an epitaxial dielectric comprising one of aluminum nitride or an oxide of silicon, aluminum, tantalum, titanium, hafnium, or zirconium.

New Claim 44 is similar to original dependent Claim 25. Claim 44 recites an electron emitter that includes a single crystal electron source, a thin conductor, an epitaxial dielectric between said single crystal electron source and said thin conductor, and an epitaxial semi-conductor between said electron source and said epitaxial dielectric layer. In support of the rejection of original Claim 25, the Office asserts incorrectly that p-region 230 in Ossipov (2003/0071256) is the claimed epitaxial semiconductor between the electron source and the thin conductor. First, there is no teaching in Ossipov that p-region 230 is epitaxial. Second, p-region 230 cannot be both the claimed electron source and the epitaxial semiconductor, as the

Office necessarily asserts to make Ossipov reach all of the claimed elements. For these reasons, Claim 44 distinguishes over Miyamoto and Ossipov.

Claims 44 and 45 depend from Claim 44 and add further distinguishing features.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,974
(208) 433-1991 x204